



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/518,426 | 08/22/2005 | Yingmin Wang | D587:54096 | 6770 |
| 23363 7590 01/23/2009 CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP PO BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068 | | | | |
| EXAMINER VLAHOS, SOPHIA | | | | |
| ART UNIT 2611 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| MAIL DATE 01/23/2009 | | DELIVERY MODE PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/518,426

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

SOPHIA VLAHOS

Art Unit

2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informality:

Claim 1, line 9, recites: "... joint detection that only taking into account..." the phrase "taking" should be changed to "takes".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tong et al. (U.S. 6,865,373)(provisional filing date 5/21/01).

With respect to claim 8, Tong et al. discloses: taking, by an encoder, two independent data fields of a time slot in input data as a processing unit (column 1, lines 42-58 (where the BTS the transmitter has a structure similar to the one shown in Fig. 3), (x1, x2) correspond to the two independent data fields that are input to the space-time encoder) with space-time orthogonal encoding method (column 1, lines 50-55), encoding the two independent data fields and generating two data vectors, thereby forming two diversity signals (column 1, lines 45-55, where the first diversity signal

includes signals x1 and x2 and the second diversity signal includes signals $-x2^*$ and $x1^*$), and transmitting said two diversity signals simultaneously with each through a corresponding diversity antenna (column 1, lines 50-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tong et al. (U.S. 6,865,373) in view of Judson et al. (U.S. 7,181,244).

With respect to claim 9, Tong et al. do not expressly disclose: wherein said two diversity signals are transmitted through two diversity beams of one smart antenna respectively and simultaneously.

In the field of wireless communications, Judson et al. disclose: diversity signals transmitted through diversity beams of one smart antenna respectively and simultaneously (column 1, lines 21-29, each diversity beam transmits phase shifted versions of a transmit signal).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Tong et al, based on the teachings of Judson et al. to decrease beam width thereby decreasing interference (Judson et al. column 1, lines 26-28).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of the record fails to teach or suggest alone or in combination: A space-time encoding and decoding method for a frequency selective fading channel, comprising: C. performing, by said terminal, joint detection that only takes into account affect to said two diversity signals from multipath interference and multi-user interference, thereby obtaining a decoding result; D. implementing interference cancellation based on a result of said joint detection to remove interference between said two diversity signals, and then returning to step C to implement iteration for decoding processing, as recited in claim 1 and in combination with other steps of the claim.

Claims 1-7 are allowed.

The prior art of the record fails to teach or suggest alone or in combination: A space-time decoding method for a frequency selective fading channel, comprising: B. performing joint detection, by said terminal, thereby obtaining a decoding result; and C. implementing interference counteraction based on a result of said joint detection to remove interference between said two diversity signals, and then returning to step B to implement iteration for decoding processing, as recited in claim 10 and in combination with other steps of the claim.

Claims 10-14 are allowed.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Al-Dhahir et al. (U.S. 7,154,964)

Al-Dhahir et al. (U.S. 6,959,047)

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SOPHIA VLAHOS whose telephone number is (571)272-5507. The examiner can normally be reached on MTWRF 8:30-17:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammed Ghayour can be reached on 571 272 3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/SOPHIA VLAHOS/
Examiner, Art Unit 2611
1/16/2009

/Mohammad H Ghayour/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611

